

# Performance Pays: Hamilton County, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services Pay for Performance Program How-To Guide



**Submitted by:**



***CPS Human Resource Services***

2923 Marketplace Dr., Suite 108

Madison, WI 53719

Phone: 877-645-6823

Fax: 608-442-5007

Tax ID: 68-0067209

**Connie Champnoise**

Regional Manager

Email: [cchampnoise@cps.ca.gov](mailto:cchampnoise@cps.ca.gov)

---

# Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Implementation Strategy .....	3
Major Work Objectives .....	4
Performance Evaluations and Pay .....	4
Steps to Implementation .....	6
Step 1: Obtain Executive Team Commitment.....	8
Step 2: Develop the Labor-Management Agreement.....	8
Step 3: Design the Process .....	9
Step 3a: Time the Evaluations.....	10
Step 3b: Identify Objectives .....	11
Step 3c: Identify Professional Standards and Personal Objectives: .....	13
Step 3d: Design the Pay System.....	14
Step 3e: Develop Measurement Tools.....	18
Step 4: Design Forms and Develop Instructions .....	19
Step 5: Provide Training and Foster Commitment.....	19
Step 6: Implement System.....	19
Step 7: Evaluate and Improve the Program's Effectiveness .....	20
Conclusions and Recommendations for Implementation.....	22

## Attachments

Attachment 1: Collective Bargaining Contract .....	24
Attachment 2: Equal Share Methodology .....	27
Attachment 3: Completed Evaluation Form.....	31

---

## Background

Public human services agencies across the country struggle to provide quality service with a workforce plagued by high turnover, low wages, huge workloads and limited professional development opportunities. A major factor in the human services profession's losing battle to recruit, retain, motivate and reward its workforce is the often outmoded and ineffective human resources management (HRM) function found in many public agencies.

Within the past few years, there has been a growing awareness of the critical role HRM must play if the problems facing the human services workforce are to be addressed. In some jurisdictions, the HRM function has taken on a strategic role, and a number of innovative programs have been implemented in an attempt to make the HRM function more flexible, responsive and supportive.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), Human Services Workforce Initiative is the first national effort to address the critical condition of the nation's human services workforce. To establish a baseline of knowledge concerning HRM in public human services agencies and the quality of the human services workforce, the Foundation funded a study of HRM best practices from 2000 through 2002. This study addressed two primary objectives:

- Identify jurisdictions leading the way in implementing HRM reforms within particular technical areas, such as recruitment, salary administration and career management.
- Determine how widespread the reported advances in public sector HRM were.

In March 2002, the Annie E. Casey Foundation commissioned CPS Human Resource Services (CPS) to study HRM best practices within public human services agencies. The study's objective was to identify jurisdictions in which HRM best practices have been effectively applied in agencies serving families, children, and neighborhoods. The project goals were to:

- Determine the "transferability" of the identified HRM best practices.
- Identify the likely barriers to successfully implementing the best practices across a wide array of jurisdictions.

CPS identified two human resources innovations we believed to be worthy of further study. One of these is the Hamilton County, Ohio, Department of Job and Family Services (JFS) pay for performance program.

JFS is the largest combined human services agency in Ohio. Public assistance, child support, and child protection programs are all administered by this single organization of over 1,600 employees. JFS programs serve more than 300,000 Hamilton County residents per year.

Hamilton County's 1,100 unionized employees are represented by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). Employees covered by the agreement perform the full range of human services for Hamilton County's residents as well as administrative support functions within the agency.

Within JFS, the "Section" is the organizational level where first-line (work unit) supervisors report. In most instances, all of the work units within a Section perform the same or similar work.

In 1998, JFS implemented its innovative Pay for Performance (PFP) system, linking pay increases and bonus awards to performance outcomes for all of their bargaining-unit employees. The program replaced the more traditional compensation system, which was based on step increases and cost of living adjustments.

One of the most significant aspects of the PFP system is that its design, implementation, and continuing administration are the product of a joint labor-management partnership. In 1997, the mechanics of PFP were hammered out at the bargaining table, and since then, joint labor-management committees work together to create, review and revise the Major Work Objectives (MWO) of the agency, the foundation for the PFP system.

Hamilton's PFP plan has two components – merit pay and bonus pay:

1. Merit pay, which is designed to become part of the base rate, is based primarily on employees' performance in meeting their Major Work Objectives. Merit pay awards are administered annually.
2. Bonus pay, which is administered semiannually, is designed to reward employees for "going above and beyond" the requirements of the job. Bonus pay is handled as a lump sum bonus, and does not become part of the base rate.

Generally speaking, merit increases are based on objective measurements while supervisors have much more discretion in the determination of bonus pay.

Hamilton's PFP program is a multifaceted process that we believe has several "best practice" components:

- JFS is committed to setting clear and measurable objectives.
- Hamilton's dedication to continuous performance management is also noteworthy. In Hamilton County, supervisors are expected to meet at least monthly with each of their direct reports to discuss work progress, accomplishments and deficiencies.
- Hamilton's PFP program includes both merit pay and bonus pay, which compliment each other. However, other jurisdictions could offer either option as a way to link performance to compensation.

---

# Implementation Strategy

In 1995, JFS implemented a pay for performance system for their non-bargaining staff. The agency director believed that it was important that bargaining-unit employees be included in the PFP system, recognizing that supervisors could achieve their objectives only through the achievements of their direct reports. By 1997, supervisors, administrators and other union-exempt employees were receiving performance-based raises, and the employees' union was willing to begin exploring the possibility of extending the PFP system to bargaining-unit employees.

During the 1997 negotiations for a new labor contract, performance pay was the major issue on the bargaining table. Although there was a desire to share in the rewards of a PFP system, the union had many concerns, including system fairness, supervisor objectivity in doing evaluations, how the work objectives were determined, and the availability of funds for pay incentives.

According to Hamilton officials, three key principles surfaced in the negotiations:

- The system had to be as objective as possible. Performance goals had to be definable and measurable to reduce the perception that raises would be based purely on subjective management judgments and favoritism.
- The focus of the system had to be on rewards for high achievers, rather than penalizing the underachievers.
- The system would be designed to be budget neutral.

Among the decisions AFSCME and JFS reached were:

- The existing grievance process would be utilized to review any performance evaluation and pay decisions that employees believed were unfair.
- JFS would redesign its budget to ensure that sufficient financial resources were available for merit pay and bonuses. For high achievers to receive more than what had been the norm, the underachievers would have to earn less.
- Labor-management committees would be established to review the Major Work Objectives (MWOs).

JFS designed a training program not only to teach supervisors and employees about the technical aspects of how the new system would work, but also to enlist the support and buy-in of everyone involved.

## ***Major Work Objectives***

The Major Work Objectives are a group of well-defined, specific outcomes that typically apply to everyone within a classification or subclassification. When JFS introduced the PFP system, the labor-management work groups designed objectives that were measurable and results-oriented. JFS formed these work groups at the Section level, and sometimes even at the work-unit level, to ensure that the MWOs would address the most important aspects of workers' jobs.

Over the years, JFS believes it has improved its ability to identify the most important objectives in each classification and to objectively measure performance. In addition, JFS' Quality Assurance Section provides supervisors and managers with numerous reports which have been designed to objectively measure worker performance.

## ***Performance Evaluations and Pay***

The Hamilton County system requires that employee evaluations occur twice a year, in January and July. Merit pay increases, which are usually based on the numerical score of the performance evaluation, are only granted in January. Bonus pay can be earned for each of the two rating periods. The amount of the merit increase is generally determined by the numerical score of the performance evaluation, but supervisors have the discretion of recommending a modification if extenuating circumstances exist. The amount of the bonus is more discretionary, with the Section manager, rather than the Human Resources department (HR), reviewing the supervisor's bonus recommendation.

When JFS implemented the PFP system, it developed an employee evaluation form reflecting the performance indicators negotiated by the labor-management committees:

- Eighty percent of the performance evaluation is based on the achievement of the Major Work Objectives.
- Ten percent of the performance evaluation is based on professional standards.
- Ten percent of the performance evaluation is based on personal objectives.

Personal objectives are optional, and if not used, are weighted at less than 10 percent. The unused percentages are assigned to either the MWOs or professional standards.

HR designed a process to determine the amount of the merit increase and/or bonus an employee could receive. For the merit increase, weights are assigned to each of the Professional Standards, MWOs, and Personal Objectives (when used). The scores from each of the weighted components are totaled for an overall score. Once all of the evaluations have been completed and submitted to HR, HR analyzes the score distribution and assigns a percentage increase to the various point intervals.

When it first designed the PFP system, JFS purposely left the bonus system parameters somewhat vague. The dollars available for bonus payments, as determined by the county commissioners, are divided among the Sections, based on the number of filled positions in the Section. Over the years, the Section managers, together with their team leaders, have devised more structured approaches to awarding the bonus payments. Some Sections have identified examples of what employees can do to earn a bonus. In most Sections, the team leaders meet as a group with the Section manager and determine the bonus amounts for staff, based on sharing detailed information about what each employee has done to deserve bonus consideration.

---

## **Steps to Implementation**

Figure 1 (page 7) summarizes the steps Hamilton County JFS used to implement its PFP system. We discuss each step of the model in very general terms, then follow with questions and answers that provide specific details on each step.



**Figure 1: Implementation Steps to the Pay for Performance System**

## ***Step 1: Obtain Executive Team Commitment***

A successful PFP program requires solid and continuing commitment from top management. Long-term commitment is critical to counter likely resistance from employees, supervisors and unions. Employees may resist because PFP will require them to be more accountable for outcomes, document their accomplishments, complete self evaluations, and participate in real performance discussions. Likewise, supervisors will need to spend time and effort documenting employee performance throughout the evaluation period and preparing evaluations. Unions are concerned about ensuring that their members receive fair and equitable performance appraisals.

### **Question 1: How did JFS obtain top management support for the idea of implementing its PFP system?**

**Answer 1:** The JFS Director realized that it was important for the JFS executive team to fully support PFP. The Director proposed the idea to the executive team and, based on the success of PFP with non-union staff, the executives embraced the proposal. They also agreed with the Director that there should be greater alignment between the objectives of supervisors and the objectives of their staff. JFS decided to approach the union with the PFP proposal.

### **Question 2: What was HR's role at this stage of the process?**

**Answer 2:** The HR Director reports directly to the JFS Director and, as a member of the executive team, was fully involved in the decision to expand PFP to bargaining-unit employees. The fact that HR negotiated with the union and led program implementation reflects their role as "business partner" at JFS.

## ***Step 2: Develop the Labor-Management Agreement***

Implementing a PFP system is a mandatory subject of bargaining in most unionized jurisdictions where compensation is negotiated. The specific requirements to be bargained regarding the compensation program will depend on the collective bargaining laws, rules, regulations and/or procedures.

### **Question 1: What were the collective bargaining requirements for Hamilton County JFS?**

**Answer 1:** Ohio state law requires all counties to collectively bargain with their employee unions. The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners has the responsibility to negotiate wages, hours and conditions of employment. In 1997, the Board of Commissioners authorized JFS to approach AFSCME to negotiate a PFP system for its bargaining-unit employees.

**Question 2: Was the PFP system negotiated during regular contract negotiations between JFS and AFSCME?**

**Answer 2:** Yes. However, JFS believed that using traditional bargaining strategies would not be a productive way to approach PFP bargaining. JFS and AFSCME invited the Ohio State Employment Relations Board to facilitate negotiations using a “Mutual Gains” bargaining strategy.<sup>1</sup> The union and management teams participated in 19 day-long facilitated sessions, where they explored their mutual interests and concerns about the performance-based pay system, as well as all the other issues that were being bargained. Ultimately, the framework for the PFP system was incorporated into the contract language and included as an appendix to the collective bargaining agreement (see Attachment 1, page 24). JFS and the union agreed to implement the system through joint labor-management committees.

**Step 3: Design the Process**

Most well designed performance management systems have three components: objectives, behaviors or competencies, and employee development plans. At the beginning of each evaluation period, managers and/or employees identify objectives and expected behaviors or competencies. Employees and supervisors may also agree on a development plan designed to improve performance or achieve long-range career objectives. These three components form the basis for the employee’s evaluation.

Before a PFP system can be implemented, the organization must make important decisions, such as how often employees will be evaluated, how the pay system will work, and how performance will be measured.

**Question 1: How were these process/design decisions made at JFS?**

**Answer 1:** During the labor-management negotiation process, the parties agreed to make a good-faith attempt to design the structural components of the PFP system through joint labor-management committees. This cooperative approach was largely successful. As soon as the formal bargaining process concluded, workgroups began designing the PFP process. HR coordinated the process and HR staff participated in many of the committees.

**Question 2: How long did the design process take?**

**Answer 2:** The committees took three to four months to design the process. In many cases, the committees developed the concepts and HR filled in the details. Overall, two HR staff members worked almost full time designing the PFP process.

---

<sup>1</sup> A “Mutual Gains” bargaining strategy, sometimes called “win-win,” “needs-based,” or “consensus” bargaining, focuses the negotiating teams on interests rather than positions. Rather than begin the negotiation with the parties taking positions at opposite ends of the spectrum and bargaining toward a compromise, the mutual gains approach encourages the parties to openly discuss their interests and concerns regarding an issue, focus on their common interests, and identify options and solutions.

**Question 3: What is the overall design of the JFS employee performance evaluation process?**

**Answer 3:** The performance evaluation tool at JFS has three elements – Major Work Objectives, professional standards, and personal objectives. The union and management agreed that the MWOs would account for 80 percent of the evaluation. The professional standards and personal objectives are each weighted at 10 percent. However, the personal objectives component is optional and may be weighted at less than 10 percent or not used at all. In these cases, the personal objectives component may be shifted to one or both of the other two components

**Step 3a: Time the Evaluations**

Organizations implementing any performance management system must determine the length of the performance evaluation period and when it will begin; the most typical length is one year. However, for many organizations, not much occurs between the time managers and employees set objectives and when the annual evaluation occurs.

In an attempt to focus continuing attention on the performance management process, some organizations require supervisors to have monthly or quarterly feedback meetings with their direct reports. Other organizations set a review period shorter than one year, where the formal goal-setting/feedback cycle occurs every six months, for example. For organizations with a one-year cycle, there are three logical beginning time periods: calendar year, fiscal year, or the year ending on the employee's anniversary date.

**Question 1: What is the length of JFS' review period and when does it begin?**

**Answer 1:** Employees at JFS are evaluated twice each year. Employees receive an evaluation in July for the January-June period and in January for the July-December period. Merit pay is based on the point score from the January evaluation, and is not available as a result of the July evaluation.

Most employees, depending on the Section where they work, prepare a self evaluation at the end of each review period that describes accomplishments during the prior six months. The supervisor considers these self evaluations when making recommendations for bonuses, which can be earned at the end of each of the six-month review periods.

**Question 2: Are there any requirements for more frequent feedback to employees beyond the two formal evaluations each year?**

**Answer 2:** Although there is no formal, agency-wide requirement, most Section managers require their team leaders to have monthly conferences with each direct report. During those meetings, the team leader shares data, when available, and otherwise discusses progress meeting the MWOs.

**Question 3: Was it difficult to get employees and supervisors to accept the twice-a-year formal rating schedule?**

**Answer 3:** Many employees and supervisors continue to believe that two ratings each year is excessive. Some are also concerned because merit pay is based on performance for only the second half of the calendar year.

**Question 4: How are evaluations handled for new hires or employees promoted or transferred within their classification during the review period?**

**Answer 4:** New employees serve a probationary period of 300 work days. To be eligible for merit and/or bonus pay, the employee must have completed 150 work days prior to the beginning of an evaluation period.

Employees who have been promoted during the review period are not evaluated or eligible for merit/bonus pay at the end of that review period. They are, in effect, treated in the same way as a new employee would be; they must have completed 150 work days prior to the beginning of the next evaluation period.

Employees who transfer to a new supervisor are evaluated by the new supervisor, who is expected to collaborate with the former supervisor.

**Step 3b: Identify Objectives**

Identifying goals or objectives is a fundamental component of most performance evaluation systems. These can help employees understand what is expected of them, clarify roles, align their work with the strategic direction of the organization, and provide something to strive for. Many organizations have adopted the “SMART” model into their objective-setting framework, as a mechanism for ensuring that their goals are well designed. (SMART stands for Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound.)

Objectives may be set by the supervisor, set jointly by the employee and supervisor, determined by upper-level management, identified through joint union-management committees, or some combination of these approaches.

**Question 1: Who sets the MWOs for each employee?**

**Answer 1.** Most MWOs are set by joint union-management committees and usually apply to all employees within a classification (i.e., Children’s Services Workers) or a subclassification (i.e., Foster Care Workers). Some MWOs are unique for individual employees because the employee has additional, different or specialized duties. An employee may have a combination of classification-wide and unique MWOs.

Most objectives are reviewed by committees at the Section level. If new or changed MWOs affect employees in other Sections, the Section chief is expected to discuss the change with the other affected Section chief(s). In some Sections, where there is considerable variation in duties from one work unit to another, the joint committee review may occur at the work-unit level.

As a variation to the SMART acronym, JFS suggests that all MWOs be results-oriented, measurable, realistic, valuable, and relevant. JFS believes that MWOs should identify the most critical tasks an employee must perform.

**Question 2: When can MWOs be changed?**

**Answer 2:** MWOs may change from one evaluation period to the next. Typically, there is a six-week period prior to the end of the review period when MWOs are updated or created. For example, May 1 through June 15 would be designated as the appropriate period for the July-December MWOs. Occasionally, program or policy changes cause an objective to become obsolete, and the MWO committee may be reconvened to modify or eliminate an objective.

**Question 3: Who serves on the MWO committees?**

**Answer 3:** The union selects the bargaining-unit representatives on each committee and the Section manager chooses the management representatives. The committee may also request a facilitator from HR or the union.

**Question 4: What if agreement cannot be reached on a particular MWO?**

**Answer 4:** If, after the parties have met in good faith to discuss the MWO, they cannot reach agreement, management has the right under the collective bargaining agreement to implement their proposed MWO. However, the committee must contact HR before the impasse is declared in order to attempt to resolve the disagreement. Fortunately, these situations were unusual at JFS.

**Question 5: Are the individual MWOs weighted?**

**Answer 5:** Yes. Typically the MWOs account for 80 percent of the total weight of the rating. Each of the MWOs should have a weight that designates its importance. For example, if there are eleven MWOs, the more important ones have greater weight than the less important ones, totaling 80 percent.

**Question 6: How are the weights set for each of the MWO?**

**Answer 6:** The labor-management committees set the suggested weights for all the MWOs in a classification or subclassification. If the supervisor and employee add to or delete MWOs based on the uniqueness of a specific position within the classification, the weights are adjusted. Weights can also be adjusted if a specific employee needs to focus on certain MWOs to a greater extent than other employees.

**Question 7: Must all MWOs have a quantifiable or objectively measurable target?**

**Answer 7:** Yes. MWOs have either numeric targets (the number of actions to be taken within a time period) or percentage target (the percentage of all actions handled with a certain timeframe).

**Question 8: What happens if factors beyond the control of the employee affects his/her ability to meet MWOs?**

**Answer 8:** As a response to the union's concern, JFS developed an "Equal Share Methodology" for certain work units. Essentially, the system compares work completed by a person to a group or Section doing the same type of work. For example, employees in a Section may have an objective of processing an average of 150 applications per month. If a policy change requires additional steps that slow down processing time, for example, and the Section average falls to 145 applications per month, each person's performance is compared to the Section average (145) to determine whether the employee met the MWO. (See Attachment 2, page 27, for more details on the Equal Share methodology.)

***Step 3c: Identify Professional Standards and Personal Objectives:***

The JFS terms "professional standards" and "personal objectives" are synonymous with what some other organizations might call "competencies" and "professional development plans," respectively. In addition to holding employees accountable for meeting MWOs, some more sophisticated performance evaluation systems also provide feedback to employees on the professional standards/competencies associated with superior job performance. Personal objectives and professional development plans focus on developing the skills and behaviors intended to improve performance.

**Question 1: What are professional standards and what role do they play in JFS' performance evaluation system?**

**Answer 1:** JFS has identified seven professional standards – the behaviors and standards of conduct JFS believes to be important to successful job performance. The seven standards are the same for all employees in the bargaining unit and remain constant. They standards are:

1. Quality and Quantity
2. Processing of Information and Documents
3. Planning, Scheduling and Prioritizing
4. Problem Solving, Decision Making and Judgment
5. Job Knowledge
6. Communication Internal/External
7. Cooperation and Teamwork

**Question 2: How are the professional standards weighted in the PFP system?**

**Answer 2:** Overall, the professional standards component is weighted at 10 percent. Within this standards category, one component, “quality and quantity” has a weight of 4 percent and each of the other six standards is weighted at 1 percent.

**Question 3: What are personal objectives and how are they used?**

**Answer 3:** Personal objectives are intended to promote personal growth and professional development. They may include formal training to improve skills such as group presentation, communication, and time management. The personal objectives section of the evaluation is optional, subject to supervisory approval. Some or all of the 10 percent weight allocated to this section can be shifted to the MWOs or professional standards.

### ***Step 3d: Design the Pay System***

Designing the policies, procedures and mechanics of a performance-based pay system can be challenging, but is critically important. The system needs to reward top performers for their achievements and provide incentives for others to excel. The system should also provide at least some cost-of-living increase to employees who meet expectations but do not excel, and provide salary increases for those new employees as they gain experience. For a PFP program to be cost neutral (which is often an objective), some employees will receive smaller increases than they would have in a traditional system, or even no increases at all. Theoretically, marginal performer will not receive pay increases and will eventually either improve their performance or leave the organization.

**Question 1: How did JFS design its PFP system?**

**Answer 1:** JFS had some experience with PFP as a result of the initial program for non bargaining-unit employees. This system served as the model for the bargaining-unit system.



## Question 2: How does the merit pay component of the PFP system work?

**Answer 2:** Eligibility for merit pay, and the amount awarded, are based on the performance evaluation. The evaluation itself is based on three components described above in question 3, with weights assigned to each objective within the MWO (Step 3b, Q&A 6).

Each MWO is also assigned a “sub-scale” that translates the targeted performance (e.g., 95 percent accuracy) into points. For example:

>96% accuracy	= 120 performance points	= Exceed
94% through 96%	= 100 performance points	= Achieved
90% through 93%	= 80 performance points	= Partially Achieved
<90%	= 50 performance points	= Did Not Achieve

The supervisor determines the percentage accuracy, which translates into the performance point number. That number is then multiplied by the weight to calculate the weighted rating. The weighted ratings from each MWO, professional standard, and personal objective (if used) are combined to determine the final numerical rating score.

For an example of a completed evaluation form illustrating the scoring, see Attachment 3, page 31.

After HR receives all of the completed evaluations, they determine the percentage of merit increase warranted by each numerical score level (i.e., the combined score from the MWOs, professional standards and personal objectives):

- Those in the “Partially Achieved” or “Did Not Achieve” ranges do not receive merit increases.
- Employees in the “Achieved” category receive a raise equal to the cost-of-living increase that they would have received under the traditional pay system.
- Those in the “Exceed” range receive merit increases of up to 4 percent (the percentage changes from year to year) higher than the “Achieved” category raises. The specific recommended percentage increase is determined by individual scores.

After the HR staff complete their analyses, they send their recommendations to the supervisors and Section managers, who make final decisions on the merit increase amounts.

## Question 3: Does HR use a formula to determine which scores receive a particular percentage merit increase recommendation?

**Answer 3:** There is no specific formula, but the scores typically fall within a normal (bell-shaped curve) distribution. The County Board of Commissioners determines the overall percentage increase that JFS can use for merit pay. JFS, however, determines how that

amount is distributed. As an example, the Board may allocate 3 percent of payroll for merit pay. HR would recommend a 3 percent increase to those who fall within the “Achieved” range, and no increase for those falling in the “Partially Achieved” and “Did Not Achieve” ranges. The remaining dollars are available for merit pay for those in the “Exceed” range. Based on the score distribution of those in the “Exceed” range and the available dollars, the percentage increases may range from 3.5 percent to 6 percent with those with the highest scores recommended for the largest increases. The maximum merit pay percentages vary from year to year.

**Question 3: Does JFS take into account external forces that may prevent employees from achieving their objectives?**

**Answer 3:** Yes, in two ways. First, supervisors are allowed to reject the HR-recommended increase and propose a different increase on an individual basis to their Section manager. For example, an employee may have been covering a vacant caseload and therefore not meet their objectives. The result could be a low evaluation score. Taking that into account, the supervisor may propose to grant a merit increase even if the evaluation score might not warrant it.

Second, JFS developed an “Equal Share Methodology” that compares the work completed by an individual to a group or Section performing the same type of work. The target for comparison becomes the group/Section average, and each person’s work volume is compared to the Section average. This methodology is described in more detail in Attachment 2, page 27.

**Question 4: Does JFS still use pay range minimums and maximums and, if so, how do they work with the PFP system?**

**Answer 4:** Yes, JFS uses them, and the County Board of Commissioners periodically adjusts the minimum and maximum rates for each classification, based on labor market forces. If these adjustments make an employee’s rate fall below the newly-established minimum, JFS automatically increases that employee’s rate to the new minimum. There is no comparable adjustment for those at, or near, the maximum rate.

**Question 5: What happens if a person at, or near, the maximum receives an evaluation score warranting a merit increase?**

**Answer 5:** If the employee is already at the maximum rate, the equivalent of the percentage increase over one year is paid as a bonus. If the employee is near the maximum, the hourly rate is increased to the maximum rate and the difference is paid as a bonus.

**Question 6: Is it possible for an employee who receives the merit increase as a bonus to receive an additional bonus payment for “going above and beyond?”**

**Answer 6:** Yes. Employees who are at the top of their salary range are eligible for both a merit increase and a bonus. The merit increase is given as a lump sum and not added to the employee’s base pay.

**Question 7: Can a supervisor recommend a merit payment for an employee whose total evaluation score warrants otherwise?**

**Answer 7:** Yes. The point score serves as the basis for HR’s recommendation to the supervisor, but the supervisor has the discretion to recommend a different amount to the Section manager. The Section manager manages the PFP dollars for the Section. However, in almost all instances, supervisors use the HR recommendation.

**Question 8: What process does JFS use to determine how payments are made for the bonus program?**

**Answer 8:** The County Board of Commissioners provides JFS with the funds for bonus pay twice each year. JFS allocates the money to Sections based on the number of filled positions in each unit. The Section managers have considerable discretion in determining how to divide the bonus money. HR has intentionally provided little guidance in this area so as to enhance supervisor discretion.

**Question 9: Can the methodology for handling bonus payments differ from one Section to another?**

**Answer 9:** Yes. Some Section managers convene a meeting of all the supervisors in their Sections, and each of these supervisors can advocate for specific bonus amounts for their direct reports until a consensus is reached on bonus payments for the entire Section. In other Sections, the team leaders have identified criteria to add structure to the process by developing examples of low, medium and high performance.

Some Section managers divide the Section allocation to each team leader to distribute, based on the number of positions in each work unit, subject to Section manager review and approval.

**Question 9a: Do employees have any input in determining bonus payments?**

**Answer 9a:** In some Sections, employees are asked to give their team leader a self evaluation that summarizes their accomplishments. Examples include serving on committees, assisting in handling the work of an absent employee, or suggesting improvements in work procedures. Some Sections have documented examples of what employees might do that would be considered “going above and beyond.”

**Question 10: Does HR have any role in determining the amount of the bonus payments?**

**Answer 10:** All bonus payment recommendations are made to HR. If HR questions any specific recommendations, HR staff discuss and resolve these concerns with Section managers. On rare occasions, HR may elevate unresolved concerns to top management.

**Step 3e: Develop Measurement Tools**

When a performance evaluation system determines employee pay, the system must be as objective as possible. Designing and implementing such systems can be time consuming and expensive. On the other hand, measuring and monitoring performance provides real value in managing any organization. Unfortunately, this is an area many public organizations have not mastered.

**Question 1: How important is having good measurement tools to the success of JFS' performance-based pay system?**

**Answer 1:** JFS believes that being able to objectively measure employee performance is critical. During negotiations in 1997, one of the union's primary concerns was the objectivity of any system that would determine employee pay. Because JFS management made a commitment to ensuring the system was as objective as possible, the union agreed to support the new system.

As part of this commitment, MWOs were developed to be as objectively measurable as possible. The professional standards, although very important, are more subjective by their very nature, which is one reason they are weighted at only 10 percent.

**Question 2: Were good performance measures in place when JFS first implemented the PFP system in 1998?**

**Answer 2:** JFS had greater ability to objectively measure performance in some areas than in others. Some timeliness and program-accuracy data were available for employees in the public assistance programs. Qualitative and quantitative measures of performance were practically nonexistent in child welfare. Overall, however, even in those Sections where data were available, objectives tended to focus more on process than outcomes. Over the years, the joint committees have learned to write better, more-measurable objectives, and JFS has made developing performance reporting systems a priority.

**Question 3: Who is responsible for developing the data that supervisors use to evaluate performance on the MWOs?**

**Answer 3:** HR, the Quality Assurance Section (QA), and the Section managers share this responsibility. Essentially, the Section managers, through the labor-management committees, determine the specific objectives for measuring that Section's employees. QA staff design and

produce the monthly reports that team leaders receive. The team leaders use the report data to provide continuous oversight and feedback to their direct reports. This is a very collaborative process, and HR plays a critical coordinating role.

### ***Step 4: Design Forms and Develop Instructions***

Once an agency has made its policy decisions and is completing the design of its PFP process, they can develop the appropriate employee performance evaluation forms and instructions.

#### **Question 1: How did JFS design its forms?**

**Answer 1:** A labor-management committee worked on form development. At JFS, the committee was able to use the non bargaining-unit supervisor/manager forms as a model.

### ***Step 5: Provide Training and Foster Commitment***

When implementing a change of this magnitude, training on the new process is critical. However, training must be complemented by communicating the rationale and philosophy behind the change. Moving from a traditional compensation system to a performance-based pay system in a unionized, public-sector organization is a huge change in an organizational culture.

#### **Question 1: What did JFS do to ensure that the move to a performance-based pay system would go smoothly?**

**Answer 1:** First, JFS communicated often with the union. As problems arose, there was a good faith attempt to resolve them jointly. Second, JFS provided training to all supervisors and managers, who were in turn expected to train their direct reports. The training was an important element in fostering acceptance of the new pay system.

In the transition year, JFS decided to award all employees a three-percent merit increase plus a one-percent bonus at the end of the first evaluation period. JFS believes that this step relieved much of the anxiety employees were feeling. It also allowed everyone to focus more on accomplishing work objectives and meeting performance standards, instead of the amount of the pay increase.

### ***Step 6: Implement System***

Many weeks or months of careful planning can be wasted without a well-designed implementation strategy. Critical implementation decisions include the scope and timing of implementation as well as how to communicate.

**Question 1: Did JFS pilot the PFP process or move directly into full-scale implementation?**

**Answer 1:** Although not considered a pilot, JFS used the PFP system with non bargaining-unit employees since 1995. The two systems are very similar in that they use the same forms and procedures, they both have merit and bonus pay, and use the same time frames. The major difference is JFS' use of labor-management committees to develop MWOs for bargaining-unit employees.

**Question 2: Did JFS have a specific communications strategy to help make the transition to the PFP process easier?**

**Answer 2:** JFS did not develop a formal communications strategy. However, communications with supervisors occurred during the PFP training sessions and in their regular meetings with Section heads. Supervisors were expected to pass the information to their direct reports. As expected, some supervisors communicated with their staff better than others. In retrospect, JFS would have provided more direct communications with employees through meetings and written material.

***Step 7: Evaluate and Improve the Program's Effectiveness***

Program evaluation is crucial, as is the timing of the first evaluation. The program must be in place long enough to make an evaluation meaningful, but assessment must be done early enough to allow corrections and improvements.

**Question 1: What steps did JFS take to evaluate the impact of implementation of its PFP system?**

**Answer 1:** JFS has taken a number of steps to evaluate the impact of the introduction of its PFP system. It conducted three employee surveys from 1999 through 2004. The union also provides ongoing feedback through the joint committees and through regular day-to-day communications. JFS has held focus groups with employees on pay, job satisfaction and retention. Top management has sought input from Section managers, and Section managers from team leaders.

**Question 2: Were the surveys, focus groups, and other ways to obtain feedback conducted in-house?**

**Answer 2:** Most of the surveys and focus group meetings have been conducted by outside organizations. The first survey was conducted by a university student as part of a research project. CPS conducted the most recent survey as part of an Annie E. Casey Foundation Grant to JFS. JFS has also contracted with consulting firms to conduct focus groups with employees and supervisors to explore issues of compensation, retention and overall job satisfaction.

**Question 3: What has JFS done to improve its PFP system?**

**Answer 3:** JFS has implemented a number of improvements:

1. By working with the labor-management committees, JFS improved the MWOs by making them more results-oriented rather than process-oriented.
2. JFS worked with the QA Section to develop data-tracking systems that support the new results-oriented MWOs.
3. In response to employee/union feedback, JFS developed the “Equal Share Methodology,” which compares the work an individual completes to that of a group or Section that does the same type of work. This innovation was a response to employee/union concerns about employees being unable to meet certain MWOs due to circumstances beyond their control. (See Step 3b, Q&A 8 and Attachment 2, page 27 for more detail on the Equal Share Methodology.)

---

## Conclusions and Recommendations for Implementation

Performance-based pay systems, as proven by Hamilton County's pay for performance program, hold tremendous promise for improving the timeliness and quality of service delivery in any human services organization. The JFS experience demonstrates that PFP programs can:

- Provide an opportunity for long term, high achievers to be financially rewarded for their superior performance, even after they have reached the maximum level of their pay range.
- Be designed to keep payroll costs at or below the level of traditional pay systems.
- Have an impact on reducing employee turnover.
- Encourage high performers to remain with an organization while encouraging weaker performers to leave.
- Improve overall work performance.
- Help an organization focus on managing outcomes rather than process.
- Be successfully implemented in a unionized environment if the organization is willing to involve the union in the development and administration of the process.
- Focus on and develop systems that allow supervisors to objectively measure performance.
- Help employees understand how their individual jobs contribute to the overall success of the organization.

Hamilton's PFP program is a multifaceted process that we believe has several "best practice" components. Although "pay for performance" is the essence of the program, there are other innovative aspects that could be implemented without performance-based pay:

- JFS' commitment to setting clear and measurable performance objectives is, in itself, worthy of replication. JFS sets MWOs cooperatively by line managers and the union, in consultation with key support units (Quality Assurance, HR, and the policy offices). The goal is to define objectives critical to the JFS strategic mission, and then provide supervisors with data and other tools they need to measure worker performance.
- JFS' dedication to continuous performance management is also noteworthy. For many organizations, performance management is a painful "once a year" activity that forces employees and their supervisors to review the past year's performance. In Hamilton County, supervisors are expected to meet at least monthly with each of their direct reports to discuss work progress, accomplishments and deficiencies. These regular meetings actually do occur, in large part because everyone's pay is affected. However,



we believe that these regular meetings occur because the organization's culture evolved to one where the focus on performance management has become second nature.

- Hamilton's PFP program includes both merit pay and bonus pay, which complement each other. However, other jurisdictions could offer either option as a way to link performance to compensation
- We believe that merit pay should be based on the full-year's performance rather than just on the performance for the second half of the year. The semiannual rating requirement reinforces the importance of outcome-driven accountability and provides more continuous feedback to employees on their performance. We recommend that the scores from both semiannual ratings be averaged to determine recommendation for merit pay.

Finally, we believe that the PFP program shows that creating a partnership between human resources and line organizations can produce real results. In Hamilton County, HR was charged with negotiating and implementing an innovative pay program in cooperation with AFSCME. To many, this would seem impossible. To Hamilton County, it was a challenge that required hard work and unprecedented cooperation. By creating a continuing partnership with its clients throughout the agency, HR is viewed as part of the solution, not the problem.

The result is a successful program that links pay to performance. Beyond that, however, the ultimate result is a more effective workforce that benefits the families and children JFS serves.

---

## **Attachment 1 – Collective Bargaining Contract Language**

## APPENDIX B BARGAINING UNIT PAY SCALE

SECTION B1: Effective upon the pay period following the execution of this agreement, the hourly pay levels for bargaining unit employees shall be as follows:

### AFSCME PAY SCALE

AFSCME	BU 71	PAY SCALE					
PAY		RANGE MINIMUM			RANGE MAXIMUM		
GRADE	HOURLY	BIWEEKLY	ANNUAL		HOURLY	BIWEEKLY	ANNUAL
1	\$ 8.82	\$ 705.60	\$18,345.60		\$ 11.29	\$ 903.20	\$ 23,483.20
2	\$ 9.18	\$ 734.40	\$19,094.40		\$ 11.74	\$ 939.20	\$ 24,419.20
3	\$ 9.56	\$ 764.80	\$19,884.80		\$ 12.24	\$ 979.20	\$ 25,459.20
4	\$ 10.06	\$ 804.80	\$20,924.80		\$ 12.88	\$ 1,030.40	\$ 26,790.40
5	\$ 10.68	\$ 854.40	\$22,214.40		\$ 13.66	\$ 1,092.80	\$ 28,412.80
6	\$ 11.01	\$ 880.80	\$22,900.80		\$ 14.55	\$ 1,164.00	\$30,264.00
7	\$ 11.80	\$ 944.00	\$24,544.00		\$ 15.58	\$ 1,246.40	\$ 32,406.40
8	\$ 12.79	\$ 1,023.20	\$26,603.20		\$ 16.86	\$ 1,348.85	\$ 35,070.10
9	\$ 13.91	\$ 1,112.80	\$28,932.80		\$ 18.36	\$ 1,468.80	\$ 38,118.80
10	\$ 14.81	\$ 1,184.80	\$30,804.80		\$ 20.16	\$ 1,612.80	\$ 41,932.80
11	\$ 15.84	\$ 1,267.20	\$32,947.20		\$ 21.55	\$ 1,724.00	\$ 44,824.00
12	\$ 16.95	\$ 1,356.00	\$35,256.00		\$ 23.05	\$ 1,844.00	\$ 47,944.00
NEW RATES BASED ON 2% INCREASE IN MIN and MAX							

This will constitute the pay range adjustment for bargaining unit employees in 2003.

SECTION B2: In contract years 2004 and 2005, bargaining unit employees shall be eligible for the same merit and supplement percentage increase approved by the Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners (HCBCC) for non-bargaining unit employees of the Hamilton County Department of Job and Family Services (HCJFS). Such merit and supplemental increases shall be effective on the same dates as non-bargaining unit employees.

Merit and Bonus in contract years 2004, and 2005 will be based on performance and effective on the same dates as non-bargaining unit employees.

SECTION B3: An employee's hourly rate of pay shall not exceed the established maximum for the assigned pay range. Once an employee's rate of pay is equal to the maximum of the assigned pay range, he/she shall be ineligible for continued merit pay but will remain eligible for supplemental pay. Supplemental pay will acknowledge specific accomplishments during the review period but will not become part of the hourly rate of pay.

SECTION B4: In the event that merit and supplemental increases are not offered to non-bargaining unit employees of the HCJFS in contract years 2004 or 2005, bargaining unit employees will receive a two (2) percent across the board hourly rate increase.

SECTION B5: In the event the Hamilton County Board of Commissioners changes the method of pay during the life of this agreement, either party to the agreement may reopen the contract on the issue of wages only and the parties will commence bargaining pursuant to 4117 of the Ohio Revised Code. Section B4 shall cease to have force and effect if the HCBCC changes the method of pay during the life of the agreement.

SECTION B6: During contract years 2004 and 2005, the Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners may institute a market adjustment to the County pay scale and increase the minimums and maximums of the pay ranges to ensure competitiveness. If the County takes such action, then the minimums and maximums of the pay ranges in the pay scale above will be adjusted accordingly.

Employees whose hourly wage drops below the new minimum will be adjusted to the minimum. Such adjustment may make the affected employee ineligible for merit and bonus pay at the end of the review period. The pay range adjustment does not affect the pay rate of other employees whose hourly wage is greater than the new minimum.

---

## **Attachment 2 – Equal Share Methodology**

## Equal Share Methodology

### Overview

The Equal Share Methodology Work Objective compares work completed by an individual to a group or section completing the same type of work. The target for comparison is the section average. Each individual's completed volume of work is compared mathematically to the section average.

The Sections listed below currently have an Equal Share Major Work Objective using this methodology:

Section/Unit	Work Type	Data Source
Call Center (946-1000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Calls answered</li><li>• ACD time</li></ul>	CentreVu
Direct Client Contact Unit (DCCU)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Applications processed (in person/mail)</li></ul>	Self reported
Health Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cases</li></ul>	App Track database
IM Intake : Employment Coaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interviews</li></ul>	App Track database
PRC Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interviews</li></ul>	Self reported
Child Support Intake Paternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interviews</li><li>• 014 report cases</li></ul>	stats
Child Care / Consumer Specialists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interviews and Reviews</li></ul>	DCMU
Child Care / VIPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Calls answered</li></ul>	CentreVu
Fraud/Investigations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overpayment claims</li><li>• Claims \$ amount</li></ul>	Claims tracking database

### Process

Once monthly, each section or unit data enters the work completed for each individual in the unit. Data entry requires the following for each individual: Worker **last name** (TELM pick list), **unit** (TELM or data entered pick list), **month, year, and quantity** completed. Workdays (used in the calculation) are automatically calculated when you enter the month and year. However, the number of days can be edited if necessary to accommodate work assignment fluctuations.

After all individuals are entered, the unit/section can run reports that complete all necessary calculations.

*Continued on next page*

---

**Time  
Guidelines**

Decision Support/PQA automated the Equal Share process with the following interpretation of time guidelines, as supported by Director Suzanne Burke. "Time" is a variable that impacts the computation and the PAYMAST interface ascertains time off according to these guidelines. For consistency purposes the automated process **will** back out **time used** during the month as listed below:

- Vacation, comp time, personal time, and FMLA time
- 20 hours of sick time per evaluation period. If more than 20 hours is used in a 6-month period or 40 hours in a 12-month period, the excess time will not be backed out.
- Funeral Leave
- Other leaves such as military, jury duty, etc.
- Authorized time off with out pay **will not** be backed out.
- Unauthorized time off with out pay **will not** be backed out.
- Up to 16 hours **may be** credited for professional development, as determined appropriate by the operational area.

---

**Reports &  
Calculations**

For the reporting period selected, the database generates a hierarchical report by individual, by unit and by section. At the individual level, the report provides the following summary data:

- number of records (individuals represented)
- hours worked: ((work days in month \* 8.0) – time used by the individual)
- quantity completed by the worker
- production per hour: quantity completed by worker / worker's hours worked
- production per day: production per hour \* 8.0
- section or unit production per day: (sum of the quantities completed by the section or unit/(sum of the section's or unit's hours worked/8.0))
- individual % of section average: (individual production per day /(sum of the quantities completed by the section or unit/(sum of the section's or unit's hours worked/8.0)))

Detail data for each individual for each month includes the following:

- CRISE ID
- Last name
- Month
- Hrs used (other and sick)
- Work days
- section

At the unit and section level the report also indicates the high and low averages within the unit/section. In addition, at the Section level and above, Standard Deviations are provided in order to assist people who are knowledgeable about and interested in their use.

---

*Continued on next page*

---

**“Floating”  
MWO Sub-  
scales**

Units without historical data, may want to set a more lenient sub-scale, using the HR/BU negotiated MWO sub-scale that follows:

>105% = E  
95 to 104% = A  
80 to 94% = P  
below 80% = D

Sections with historical data to reference can set relatively challenging MWO sub-scale targets based on historical averages. For example, historically, the unit average in Unit A, (10 workers) is 100. However, individual averages range from 97 to 103 (97, 97, 98, 98, 99, 101, 102, 102, and 103, 103). Using the scale above, everyone in Unit A would receive an Achieve rating, as everyone's percent of the average ranges from 97% to 103%. In this unit, the following sub-scale would be more effective:

>102% = E  
99 to 101% = A  
96 to 98% = P  
below 96% = D

It is likely that real work units will have greater variation in individual quantity completed. The MWO sub-scale set, should be challenging but ensure a fairly normal (bell shaped) distribution curve, with most individuals receiving an achieve rating.

An individual at 100% of the unit average is doing “average” work production. Unless there is *little to no* variation in individual quantity completed, the top of the A rating range should extend **beyond 100%**.

---

**Caution**

It is imperative that self-reported data be avoided if possible to report quantities completed. Staff could unknowingly or intentionally skew the section average and their percent of the average. The use of Equal share in groups/units of 4 or less is also not recommended, for the same reason.

---

*Revised 9/25/03*



---

## **Attachment 3 – Completed Evaluation Form**

**HAMILTON COUNTY**  
**PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**  
**PART I**  
**PERFORMANCE SUMMARY**  
**●BARGAINING UNIT EVALUATION●**

**CHECK TYPE OF REVIEW**

- ☒ Semi-Annual    Year:    Period:  
☐ Mid-Probationary  
☐ Final Probationary    ☐ RETAIN OR    ☐ REMOVE FROM POSITION  
☐ Special

Name Experienced Employee	Social Security No. 222-22-2222	Review Deadline 12/31/04
Department / Unit Intake	Classification Title Eligibility Technician	

Rater's Comments:

Rater's Signature:

Date:

Reviewer's Comments:

Reviewer's Signature:

Date:

Employee's Comments:

Employee's Signature:

Date:

My signature acknowledges receipt of but not necessarily agreement with this evaluation.

**HAMILTON COUNTY**  
**PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**  
**PART II**  
**EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE ON STANDARDS**  
**●BARGAINING UNIT EVALUATION●**

<b>1. QUALITY AND QUANTITY:</b>	
! Consistently completes work assignments in an accurate, neat, well organized manner ! Manages multiple assignments, tasks	! Accomplishes required assignments within required time frames/deadlines
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>4%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	
<b>2. PROCESSING OF INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS:</b>	
! Organizes, prepares and maintains documentation and information ! Reviews, revises and retrieves documents and information	! Operates and maintains equipment in an appropriate manner ! Carries out oral and written instructions
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>1%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	
<b>3. PLANNING, SCHEDULING AND PRIORITIZING</b>	
! Organizes, plans and achieves personal work assignments ! Performs job tasks efficiently and in a timely manner	! Demonstrates effective time management skills ! Meets appropriate standards based on performance indicators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>1%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	
<b>4. PROBLEM SOLVING, DECISION MAKING AND JUDGEMENT</b>	
! Identifies issues and problems ! Collects relevant information ! Identifies alternative course of action ! Arrives at sound practical conclusions ! Implements solutions on a timely basis	! Monitors effectiveness of solutions and recommends changes as needed ! Maintains confidentiality ! Focuses on the situation, issue or behavior, not on the person
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>1%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	

<b>5. JOB KNOWLEDGE</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Participates in training and educational opportunities to enhance job growth</li> <li>! Knows theoretical, practical and routine aspects of present job</li> <li>! Stays familiar with the function of the agency/division</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Remains current and understands policies, procedures, and regulations</li> <li>! Applies knowledge effectively to job duties</li> <li>! Brings innovative ideas to the attention of others</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>01%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	
<b>6. COMMUNICATION INTERNAL/EXTERNAL</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Employs effective communication skills when listening, speaking and writing</li> <li>! Demonstrates tact and diplomacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Provides clear direction and information</li> <li>! Ensures responsiveness to public and customers</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>1%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	
<b>7. COOPERATION AND TEAMWORK</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Provides objective feedback</li> <li>! Prepares for, attends and actively participates in meetings</li> <li>! Promotes the sharing of information</li> <li>! Adapts to and advocates for positive change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Shares resources to maximize results</li> <li>! Maintains good relationships with coworkers and supervisor(s)</li> </ul>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT (% of total job importance): <b>1%</b>
Rater's Comments and Recommended Action:	

**HAMILTON COUNTY**  
**PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**  
**PART III**  
**PERFORMANCE ON MAJOR OBJECTIVES**  
**●BARGAINING UNIT EVALUATION●**

**AGREEMENT** (Signature and Date):

By Employee: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ By Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

**GUIDELINES FOR DRAFTING OBJECTIVES**

- 1. Results oriented** Identifies recognizable and mutually desirable end condition beyond standard operating measures or routine results -- not the process, activities or means to an end and not business as usual.
- 2. Measurable** Identifies time limits and agreed-on criteria, whether objective and numerical or subjective and qualitative, for assessing progress toward end achievement and key increments.
- 3. Realistic** Identifies scope that is challenging but reasonably attainable within limits of funding and authority.
- 4. Valuable** Identifies unquestionable value to affected consumers, clients or constituents as well as the employee and supervisor.
- 5. Relevant** Identifies alignment of end condition with the mission and primary activities; generally unique to new challenges or opportunities related to improvement of the organization's key result areas.

**Note:**

1. Attach copies of this form for additional objectives.
2. At least one objective should promote personal growth and professional development. This objective might be related to, but is not limited to: analytic skills, writing skills, computer skills, presentation skills, effective meeting facilitating skills, time management skills, or other job related skills.
3. Objectives and relative weights may be reaffirmed or redirected at any time during the rating period by mutual agreement.

**1:** The employee shall process an equal number of the monthly average of applications received in Intake. This objective is measured by taking the total number of applications assigned to Intake for a six month period and dividing the available Employment Coaches. All FMLA leave, vacation and up to 20 hours of sick leave used will be deducted. The number of applications will be captured from CSDS in the APP track database maintained in intake.

102.5% or above of average of unit = E = 120, 93.5%– 102.4% of average of unit = A = 100, 79.5% – 93.4% of average of unit = P = 80, 79.4% or less of average of unit = D = 50

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance): <b>5%</b>
---	---

Comments on Progress:

**2:** Complete 95% of all applications as defined by policy. The determination of eligibility must be completed as rapidly as possible within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of application. The performance scale is: 95.5 or above = E = 120, 94.5 –95.4 = A = 100, 90.5 – 94.5 = P = 80, Below 90.5 = D = 50

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance): <b>20%</b>
---	--

Comments on Progress:

**3:**Maintain at least 95% accuracy rate for Food Stamps as determined by the Internal Teer process. A maximum of four cases will be reviewed each month. The performance scale is: 95.5 or above = E = 120, 94.5 –95.4 = A = 100, 90.5 – 94.5 = P = 80, Below 90.5 = D = 50

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance): <b>20%</b>
---	--

Comments on Progress:

**4:** Maintain a 96% accuracy on cases transferred to the ongoing ISBU's. Justified errors include: pending assistance groups, improper eligibility determinations, pending actions, no CLRC or improper assignment. Appropriate assignment is the assignment of all OWF applications to the Work Activity Clearing House by completing the WPA screens as defined in the Work Participation administrative letter. The performance scale is: 96.5 or above = E = 120, 95.5 –96.4 = A = 100, 93.0 – 95.4 = P = 80, Below 92.9 = D = 50

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>20%</b>
---	---	------------

Comments on Progress:

**5:** Complete 98% of OWF applications timely as defined by policy with no more than 45 days elapsing between the date of application and the mailing of the warrant. . The performance scale is: 98.5 or above = E = 120, 97.5 –98.4 = A = 100, 94.0 – 97.4 = P = 80, Below 94.4 = D = 50

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>5%</b>
---	---	-----------

Comments on Progress:

**6:** Initiate contact for new hire employment within three work days and reflect New Hire employment income appropriately in the budget within 30 days of the alert date or note in CLRC a plausible reason for unavailable verification. . The performance scale is: 0 delinquent alerts = E = 120, 1 – 2 delinquent alerts = A = 100, 3 - 4 delinquent alerts = P = 80, More than 4 delinquent alerts = D = 50

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>10%</b>
---	---	------------

Comments on Progress:

**7:** Personal Objective: To attend “Customer Service” training

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>10%</b>
---	---	------------

Comments on Progress:

**8:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>%</b>
--	---	----------

Comments on Progress:

**9:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>%</b>
--	---	----------

Comments on Progress:

**10:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded <input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve	RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):	<b>%</b>
--	---	----------

Comments on Progress:

<b>11:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve
RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):			<b>%</b>
Comments on Progress:			

<b>12:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve
RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):			<b>%</b>
Comments on Progress:			

<b>13:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve
RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):			<b>%</b>
Comments on Progress:			

<b>14:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Achieve
RELATIVE WEIGHT(% of total job importance):			<b>%</b>
Comments on Progress:			

# Evaluation Worksheet Tool

Name: Experienced EmployeeExperienced	Social Security No.: 222-22-2222222-22-2222	12/31/04
Department / Unit: IntakeIntake	Classification Title: Eligibility Technician	

To use the BUTool: Double click any cell, this will activate Excel and the BUTool spreadsheet. Enter data as needed and click outside of the spreadsheet (on the Word document), Excel will deactivate and place you back into the evaluation. NOTE: If you scroll too far in the spreadsheet and cannot see the data, hold Ctrl and press the Home key on the keyboard.

#	Actual Performance	Target Performance	Performance Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Performance Level
Professional Standards						
1	3	2	150%	4%	6.0	E
2	2	2	100%	1%	1.0	A
3	3	2	150%	1%	1.5	E
4	2	2	100%	1%	1.0	A
5	2	2	100%	1%	1.0	A
6	2	2	100%	1%	1.0	A
7	3	2	150%	1%	1.5	E
						13.0
	Major Work Objectives					
1	100	100	100%	5%	5.0	A
2	120	100	120%	20%	24.0	E
3	100	100	100%	20%	20.0	A
4	120	100	120%	20%	24.0	E
5	120	100	120%	5%	6.0	E
6	100	100	100%	10%	10.0	A
7			0%		0.0	
8			0%		0.0	
9			0%		0.0	
10			0%		0.0	
11			0%		0.0	
						89.0
	Personal Objectives					
1	100	100	100%	10%	10.0	A
2			0%		0.0	
3			0%		0.0	
						10.0
Total Objective Weight				100%		
TOTAL PERFORMANCE SCORE					112.0	E
Revised 4/2002						



# HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS KEY PERSONNEL POLICIES ANNUAL REVIEW ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I have read (or had read to me) the following Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners Personnel Policies:

- ! Employee Status, Section 2.3
- ! Ethics of Public Employment, Section 6.0
- ! Fair Employment Rights and Responsibilities (with the SOP), Section 6.1
- ! Telecommunications Policy, Section 6.6
- ! Alcohol Consumption Policy, Section 6.10
- ! Drug-Free Workplace Policy (with the SOP), Section 6.11

I fully understand these policies. I also understand that compliance with the Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners Personnel Policy Manual is a condition of employment with Hamilton County and that violation on my part subjects me to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Employee Name (Please Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor Name (Please Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Employee Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Hamilton County Department of Job and Family Services  
County Department

Please attach signed acknowledgment to the employee's performance appraisal due in January and return with the performance appraisal to Human Resources.